



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## VII.

# THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT UNDECIDED.

---

### I.

It is in politics as in Nature—there is action and reaction ; there is ebb and flow ; there is the light of the sun in its meridian splendors, and there are eclipses when it is veiled by inferior bodies. During an eclipse, the savage fears that the sun is dead. His experience does not give him faith in the immortality of light. So, also, in the affairs of nations the morally luminous eras are succeeded by epochs of eclipses of faith. At such times the coward is hailed as a prophet, and “rises above party.” Mental dyspepsia is regarded as an evidence of intellectual health.

History teaches that he who has faith in his race is always in the right—not always as to times, but always as to time ; that intellectual progress is a law of our nature as infallible in its operations as the laws that govern the planets in their orbits ; and that the revolutions of mankind, like the revolutions of the earth, never go backward ; that human advancement, like the sun, goes on forever, “ without haste, yet without rest.”

We see to-day an eclipse of faith political. We hear old soldiers of the greatest political army that the ages have ever seen speak despondently of the future of the Republican party. They talk of its career as if its coffin already stood open at the foot of its gallows. Even leaders, who see the folly of surrender, when, hastily snatching off its Ku-Klux robes, it masquerades under the name of conciliation, are heard lamenting on the house-tops that the days of the Republican party are numbered. “The hand is the hand of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob.” However scholarly the words of the lament may be, its spirit is the spirit of the savage when the sun is eclipsed. It is the utterance of ignorance, or of forgetfulness of the permanent laws of Nature,

in presence of the fleeting phenomena that seem to contradict them.

Henry Wilson could see no reason why the Republican party should not endure a thousand years. One of his old colaborers has said, in this REVIEW, that he can see no reason for its existence to-day. I think the Vice-President was right. I believe that the Republican party has a greater work before it than the past ever called on it to do ; that, however it may have failed in some minor tasks, it has always been faithful in great things ; that it has always been true to its primitive principles ; that it has always been dutiful to the nation, and to the seminal ideas by whose divine energy the child-republic became a giant among the peoples of the earth. It will endure just as long as it worthily represents the principle of Progress, or, to use the newer phrase, of Evolution, a perennial and elemental power of human nature ; just as long as it is confronted by an organization hostile to every phase of human development, whether in the individual or the State or the nation ; an organization whose ideal leader is a political Columbus with his eyes in the back of his head—sailing American waters under the American flag, but ever seeking, with a longing unappeasable, for a South-West passage to the lost but loved Laurentian seas of our antediluvian world.

I am not alarmed at the personal or factional dissensions within the Republican party. These are the mere flotsam and jetsam thrown up by the self-moving Gulf Stream of Republican destiny. No man, however gifted, no officeholder, however distinguished, can permanently influence the course of the resistless flow of political power. The war demonstrated the truth that here the people rule—that heroes and leaders are no longer necessary to them. General after general, once the idol of the army and the nation, failed or was deposed ; but the irrepressible conflict still went on as if they had never lived. The war-President was slain. There was a ripple, and no more. He who had been looked on as the great civil leader, was found to have been a trusted friend in council, and nothing greater ; no more necessary to the success of the nation than the humblest soldier in her ranks. Men die, or fall out of line, or desert to the enemy : Lincoln, or Sumner, or Johnson—excepting as to the verdict rendered on their career—it is all one with the people : the undying, self-disciplined, self-

governed, and ever-faithful army, still marches on. No ambition sways them, no reverses discourage them, no lowering clouds dismay them. *They* have no old harps that they must keep in tune with the songs of to-day. The only consistency they respect is the record of persistent growth. It is these traits that cause some politicians to misconstrue their purpose. It is personal egotism that causes other politicians to follow the will-o'-the-wisp of an ambition to "rule" the people, or to impress on them the brand of their individual beliefs. The only man fit to be the "ruler" of a republic, the only man who can ever succeed as a President, is he who has no policy of his own to enforce against the will of the people—he who has no policy at all, excepting faithfully to execute the laws of the people. Looked at in the light of history, every attempt to "rule" the Anglo-Saxon race in any other sense than as a servant to enforce their own rules, is noteworthy only as the policy of Charles I. is noteworthy—as a startling illustration of the tragical element that lies hidden behind the mask of the ludicrous; or as Mrs. Partington's heroic effort with her broom to arrest the advancing tide of the Atlantic, or Mr. Calhoun's similar effort with his pen to arrest the irrepressible growth of the antislavery sentiment is noteworthy—as ludicrous only in one instance, and ludicrous and tragical in the other instance. Charles I. and John C. Calhoun were both men of excellent intentions and of good personal character, but, like another distinguished successor in the same field of disaster, they were men of narrow views, of a Jonah's-gourd-like vanity, and lacking alike in gratitude and sympathy. Hence, their careers ended in a tragedy; hence, one lost his life, and the other ruined his state; and hence, also, even if they lived to-day, it is questionable whether they would not still "serenely" contemplate the ruin they had wrought, and attribute it to the stubbornness and "corruption" of politicians rather than to their own linear folly.

No one can doubt that the Republican party has been the party of progress. It began its life by driving back the destroying angel of slavery from the Territories. As soon as it came of age it grappled with the demon of treason, and slew him who sought the young nation's life. Beneath its divine displeasure, human slavery disappeared from our land forever. Of four millions of bondmen it made freedmen. Of four millions of freed-

men it made citizens. Divine in its compassion as in its anger, no soldier of slavery was punished for his unmanly crime. He was treated as an erring child. Treason was not made odious by any national decree. One by one, platoon by platoon, State by State, the dastards who fought fiercely in order that they might safely enslave a weaker race; that they might rob the blacks of the fruits of their toil, and sell the fruits of their love, without rebuke or retribution—were rapidly restored to their civil and political rights. The prodigal sons were welcomed home. They were trusted. History has no similar story of magnanimity to tell. No organization of men, whether religious or political, has a more lustrous record than the Republican party. Other parties have blessed their friends; this party alone showered benefactions on its foes. For once only on this planet the loftiest teaching of Christianity was practised by a political organization.

With what result? There is a solid South. That solid South has allied its political fortunes with the Democratic party. They are as Eng and Chang, one and indivisible. Without the solid South the Democratic party would be a feeble faction—a moral night-scavenger's cart, laden with the offscourings of Tipperary civilization, instead of a war-chariot armed with disciplined and exultant soldiers, confident of an early victory over their benefactors.

No man denies or can deny that the South will rule the republic if the Democratic party succeeds at the next presidential election. By "South" I mean the old rulers of the Southern Confederacy—the Bourbon Democracy—not the *people* of the Southern States, but the present controllers of their political organizations. For, the ex-Confederate politicians and the Democratic leaders of the South are the same men, inspired by the same spirit, teaching the same ideas, blighted in heart by the same intolerance, cursed in soul by the same prejudices of race and of creed, which caused the old South to linger so far behind the North in the march of civilization, and flung her at last into the arms of a civil war.

Are these men fit to govern the nation? I answer, No. Is this, then, a time to despair of the Republican party? I answer, No. It is a time to fight, not a time to mourn; a time to unfurl a banner, not a time to prepare a tomb. And to this high duty,

rising far above all personal contests, and removing the conflict far from the malarial regions of the White House, the patriot who loves America because of her freedom, and the philanthropist who loves America because of her humanity, should urge the young men of the nation to prepare at once. For, it is the people's battle once more that is approaching.

I do not say that the South should not rule the republic solely or chiefly because its leaders were traitors to the republic. That, surely, is a sufficient reason. A protest against the rule of the ruiners is the dictate of prudence, not the utterance of hate. Magnanimity becomes imbecility; manly forgiveness becomes eunuchal sentimentality; Shakespeare becomes a Tupper—when it is contended that we have not condoned the colossal crime of the nineteenth century until we shall have subjected ourselves to the rule of its chief confederates. The ablest plea ever made for this policy by the ablest, and now almost the solitary, advocate of it collapses at the slightest pen-prick. A Federal brigadier-general had orders to watch a certain corps of the Southern army. He had discretionary orders. On the movements of the enemy depended his action. If they were dislodged, he was to pursue them; but, if they had held their position (if I rightly remember), he was directed to attack them. He says he eagerly watched the cannonade, and that it gave him pleasure when he saw havoc wrought in their ranks. Why? "Because we were at war." By a logic that transcends all earthly rules, he drew the deduction that the reason why the South calmly looked on at the outrages of the Ku-Klux and such massacres as that of Colfax and of Kemper County was because we were still at war. Hence, according to this super-mundane argument, the rule of two Southern States was justly given over to the armed minority; and Packard and Chamberlain, the choice of the majority, were deposed by a national Executive sin of omission, not as an act of necessity, but "because it was right." Would not the same logic have taught him, in battle, not to fight, but to surrender?—not to coerce, but to "let alone?" We did not let the South go; we cannonaded it back into the Union; we compelled it to lay down its arms. We did not dream of conciliation until resistance ceased. And now, I hold, the cure for all the evils we endure—all of them spawned by rebellion—is not to be found in

conciliating the men who owe their lives and estates to our compassion, and repay the debt by undying hatred and ceaseless obloquy, but in maintaining the ideas and by sustaining the party that restored the Union of the fathers, clad now in the white robes of freedom, unsullied and irreproachable. It is civic blasphemy against the memory of the glorious hosts of young men who went down gladly into their graves that the Union might live, to compare them, even for a moment, with the dark legions who preferred to risk their lives rather than part with their unholy power to enslave and traffic in the flesh and blood of their fellow-men. Such comparisons are odious in the sight of gods and men. They obliterate the distinctions between right and wrong. They abolish all the heroisms of history. They put crowns on the heads of persecutors and martyrs alike. There is only one phrase that correctly describes this theory; and, although it is not classical, it is pictorial: that phrase is, *moral mush*. It is the philosophy of bats and owls—the blindness that comes to the purblind by an excess of light. And whatever the blind leaders of the blind may say, history will record that the great struggle of the rebellion was not a contest of “Greek against Greek,” but of the powers of darkness against the powers of light; of ancient barbarism against modern civilization; of a despotism founded (as Alexander H. Stephens stated that the Southern Confederacy was to be founded) on the slavery of the black race against a free republic, based upon the sacred brotherhood of man.

But, apart from its crime of rebellion, the South should never rule this republic, because it has demonstrated its incapacity to govern a republic. Statesmanship is a physical science. A youth asked one of Plutarch’s heroes if he could play a flute. “No,” was the statesman’s haughty reply; “but I can make a little village a great city.” That is the test of statesmanship. The South can play on the flute of its own vanity, it can blow the trumpet of its own praises admirably well, for egotism is the distinguishing trait of all semi-civilized and uneducated men and nations. But the perpetual vaunt about Southern “statesmanship” could be silenced at once in any grand inquest by the simple demand for a solitary proof of it. Where is that evidence to be found?

Southern statesmanship had an easy task. Nature gave New England rocks and ice as its chief natural products; and New

England is now fertile, intelligent, and rich. Her colonies are the most prosperous commonwealths that the sun looks down on, and their people are educated, industrious, and humane. Nature gave the South an earthly paradise, with a sweet climate and affluent lands, and royal harbors, and great rivers that arteried every State, and mines of more than imperial wealth. What is the old South to-day as compared with the old North? A howling wilderness, with a people ignorant, indolent, and poor.

If it is answered that the present poverty of the South is the result of the war, Southern "statesmanship" is not thereby acquitted of incapacity, for her "statesmen" created the war, and they are responsible for its results. War, too, is a physical science. It is true that the South was "overpowered" by the North, but it was the duty of Southern "statesmanship" to estimate the forces they provoked. They showed their incapacity to rule by seeking their ends through war, with a calculable superiority of physical power against them. Theirs was the political delirium of the Irish demagogues who overthrew the policy of Daniel O'Connell, the one great statesman of Ireland, in order to seek by violence what they could have gained by peace. The South showed all the hot hardihood, all the useless valor of the Irish insurgents, who (taking Napoleon's estimate of the power of machinery) rushed in 1848 into a contest in which they were sure to be outnumbered about twenty to one. The Southern struggle was magnificent, but it was not war. The Southern soldiers fought with superb courage; but Ajax defying the lightning was not war, nor was their defiance of the nation.

If it is still argued that the war was the chief cause of the present condition of the South, and that the North was equally responsible for it, the answer is, that the South lost far less by the war than is claimed or generally supposed. Individuals in the South lost their property in slaves, but the South itself did not lose their labor. Emancipation did not take one dollar from the capital of the South. As much as the ambitious labor of a freeman is more valuable than the reluctant toil of a slave, just so much is the South richer to-day because of emancipation. The real property destroyed by war was not greater *in* the South than *by* the North—in material of war, in loss of service, and by taxation. The State and municipal war-debts of the South were ex-



punged; the State and municipal war-debts of the North were preserved. Besides, Chicago and Boston lost far more by their fires than the South lost by all the houses actually destroyed in the great conflict.

But the incapacity of the South to rule a republic is demonstrated by the hastiest glance at her condition before the war began; at a time when two centuries of unbroken rule had brought forth the perfect fruits of Southern "statesmanship." At the birth of the nation Virginia held the first place in the relative rank of the States in population. She maintained this position until 1810. In 1860 she held only the fifth rank—New York (which held the fifth place in 1790) now leading the roll, followed by Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. Virginia held the tenth place in 1870. North Carolina held the third place in 1790—only the twelfth in 1860. She held the fourteenth place in 1870. South Carolina held the seventh place in 1790—the eighteenth in 1860. She held the twenty-first place in 1870. New York had increased her population in seventy years from 340,120 to 3,880,735; Virginia, from 748,308 to 1,596,318 only. North Carolina, in 1790, had 393,751 souls; in 1860 she had only 992,622. South Carolina had 249,073 inhabitants in 1790, and, at the opening of the war, only 703,708. Thus, slowly, in spite of every natural advantage, had the three leading slave States, under Southern "statesmanship" advanced; thus rapidly were they left behind under the statesmanship of the North, in the grand march of the States to prosperity.

They who are faithful and skillful in small things—and they only—can be safely trusted by the nation with greater political duties and responsibilities. Are these Southern bunglers, who could not keep time with statesmen whom they affected to despise in this long march of seventy years, who have been left so far behind that they seem now to be stragglers resting by the wayside—are these hungry braggarts, clad with poverty in a desolation they have made, worthy to be chosen stewards of the nation's wealth? And yet, this is the "practical" remedy proposed for existing evils by men who argue that the Republican party should now abandon its organization!

Tried by Henry Clay's evidence, the South should keep or be kept in a back seat until the work of national recuperation

shall be completed. In one of his popular sophomore discourses—then, in the boyhood of the nation, esteemed eloquent orations—the famous Kentucky politician (for he was in no high sense a statesman) declared that the only light by which his feet could be guided was the light thrown by the lamp of experience. Does that light lead the feet of the republic to the plantations of Virginia and the Carolinas for men competent to govern it? Does it guide us to the wrinkled “Mother of States and statesmen” for successors to the power of Abraham Lincoln, when history tells us that the “statesmen” of whom she so loudly vaunted brought their own State from affluence to beggary? Under the evil eye of Southern “statesmanship,” prosperity shriveled up and fled from the South; and Virginia, no longer seeking to win back from New York the proud title of the Empire State, settled down into the ignominy of breeding slaves for the Gulf States, and the deeper ignominy of defending the ignominy.

## II.

“Can the leopard change its spots?” The negative of this question would seem to be supported by the greater weight of human testimony. Even in these days of iconoclastic inquiry, it is admitted by scientific men that radical changes need ages in which to complete their evolution. But, in the world of politics, a class of empirics has arisen, whose motto is the declaration of Molière’s doctor, “*Nous avons changé tout cela.*” In their creed the hope of the country lies in the rescue of the national Government from the hands of the patriots who saved it, and in placing it in the keeping of the traitors who tried to destroy it. They praise men like the Gulf-State orator who denied that the South had been guilty of treason, but, on the contrary, that the South went out of the Union to save the Constitution, “hugging it to its bosom,” as it went out, weeping.

“True patriots they; for, be it understood,  
They *fought* their country for their country’s good!”

These empirics claim that the once untamable “Southern tiger” has totally changed its nature; that it is now as gentle and innocent as a paschal lamb; that there are to-day no vital issues in political life on which Southern “statesmen” cannot be

trusted with as much safety to the national honor as the Republican party could be trusted with them.

Let us call up in review one or two only out of scores of important issues still undecided, and in doing so inquire whether the right decision is likely to be reached by the Democratic rather than the Republican party.

There is one issue—invisible, mysterious, and intangible—which no eye here hath seen, nor hath it entered into the mind of any man to tell whence it came nor whither it hath gone—the name of it civil-service reform. It is like “political corruption” and “total depravity” in two essential traits—it is much talked about, and there is not much of it. Civil-service reform, when it is not a cant shibboleth, at its best is a mere patent-medicine remedy for a disease that only “constitutional treatment” can cure. The remedy for dishonesty in politics lies in the election of honest men only to every elective office. The remedy for incompetent government lies in the election of able men only. It rests with the people to apply these remedies—for men both honest and able abound in every State, and will readily respond to the people who desire them as representatives. Competitive examinations, according to the formulas hitherto devised, would be mere tests of memory—not of executive capacity; and, under its operation, every Government department would be an organized regiment of spies and informers. Establish an inflexible system of promotions in line, and every inferior officer would become the natural enemy of his immediate superior. Piety does not consist of a correct knowledge of the Longer or Shorter Catechism; nor is the capacity to administer affairs to be determined by competitive examinations. A lady may be duly qualified to be an excellent copyist, and still not bowed down with the weight of her erudition concerning the isothermal line. Yet an applicant lost her chance for employment under the civil-service rules by a failure to define this scientific term. All such empiric methods are mere ropes of sand in the hands of expert politicians. They are easily evaded. To apply these tests, whatever literary amateur politicians may say, is *not* to “conduct the departments on business principles.”

Until literary men, as a class, show as much capacity for the protection of their own interests as the less pretentious but more

practical business men of *all* classes, their voice will have little weight in moulding national legislation. A distinguished namesake of mine, once Senator from Pennsylvania, has been widely ridiculed for speaking with a certain disrespect of "these literary fellows." Yet the Senator had a reason for his scorn of their dictation. Every inventor, for example, even of a mouse-trap, can secure, through national legislation and international treaties, protection for his mechanical skill in almost every civilized nation. Yet Mr. Longfellow and Mr. Emerson, and all the illustrious authors of the land, cannot protect *their* productions one mile beyond the limits of the country. Are men who do not know how to protect themselves fit teachers of practical statesmanship? Do the literary class marvel that national legislators do not pay a swift homage to their political suggestions? The truth is, that their remedies show an utter ignorance for the most part of existing methods as well as of business rules. No honest attempt within my knowledge has ever yet been made, excepting for a brief period under President Grant, to apply the vaunted principles of civil-service reform to national affairs. It is equally true that, if so applied, they would speedily break down, not from the strength of "corruption" opposing them, but from their own inherent feebleness and folly. No business in the country is conducted so ably as the business of the Government of the United States.

Again, the commercial business of this nation is not conducted so honestly as the business of the Government. Reading the diatribes of "reformers," one would think, if unfamiliar with the facts, that a large majority of the Federal office-holders are dishonest. There were estimated to be about eighty thousand persons employed in civil offices in the service of the United States. Yet, outside of Johnson's Administration (when officers were appointed to inaugurate a "Southern policy"), not eighty dishonest men were ever discovered. Mr. Spinner was Treasurer of the United States for fifteen years, and thousands upon thousands of millions of dollars went through his office. He had a regiment of subordinates. How much was lost and stolen? Less than one ten-thousandth of one per cent., and even this percentage was largely owing to three robberies against which no ordinary precautions could prevail. Of these three robberies, two

of the perpetrators were discovered and punished. Can "legitimate business" present so favorable a record? Let us see. During the three years ending with 1875, or in the beginning of 1876 (the latest returns at this writing within my reach), the aggregate liabilities of the bankrupts in the United States amounted to \$585,000,000. Their aggregate assets did not reach 33½ cents on the dollar. Commenting on this fact, a commercial journal at the time remarked:

"Is there any one who believes that the greater part of this wide margin is not lost under circumstances little better than plain stealing? After allowing for the shrinkage of values, for losses counted twice, and for inevitable misfortunes, the loss is too great to be incurred honestly. The bankrupts have not only lost every dollar of their own, but two-thirds of all they could borrow; and, as no man knowingly gives credit to an insolvent, it is not an over-estimate to say that the bankrupts of the United States have dishonestly made away with at least \$300,000,000 of the means of their confiding creditors within three years. It will hardly do for private life to assume a superior morality, and affect to dread any contagion from political corruption."

Dismissing, then, as literary quackery the civil-service reform panacea, and as ignorant slander the charges of political corruption—asserting and believing that the affairs of the nation have not only been more honestly, but, on the whole, far more ably administered under recent Republican rule than at any other period of our history, and that it is vastly superior in both respects, and in almost every respect, to the government of any nation on the earth—I come to questions of greater importance and of more immediate interest.

But admitting, for the sake of argument—or conciliation—that civil-service reform *is* a vital issue, does any sane man believe that it can be accomplished under national Democratic rule? Let the entertaining history of the Doorkeepers of the House of Representatives answer for me. Every appointment made by them has been governed by the old maxim of the Democracy, "To the victors belong the spoils." I pass on.

Capital and labor, the house of Have and the house of Want, present to us an issue not yet decided.

Would the wealth-holders of the nation be benefited by a

national Democratic victory? Would taxation be less burdensome with the South encamped in the White House and in both Houses of the Congress? Would the national debt be secure under Southern domination?

It is a time to speak the truth in plain words, and "the truth I shall speak impugn it whoso listeth."

The South constantly prates of its honor. The word is its substitute for the Irishman's coat-tail at Donnybrook Fair. Who-so treads on it must fight. But the commercial history of America shows that no section is so utterly devoid of commercial honor as the South has always been in its dealings with its creditors of the North. It is almost impossible to collect debts there to-day, even when the debtors are solvent.

What has been the financial record of the ex-Rebel States since the close of the war? I believe that every one of them—certainly nearly every one of them—as soon as it passed under Democratic control, has "scaled" or "graded" or "compromised" or "repudiated" or silently refused to pay its State and county and municipal debts. The history of their financial action has been an unbroken chronicle of bad faith with their creditors. When these things are done in all the Southern States as separate communities, what can we expect should the South obtain control of the finances of the United States?

The North regards the national debt as a solemn covenant with the creditors of the nation. No property is regarded as so sacred. The shadowy host of all the patriots who died for their country encompasses and protects it. Neither the "greenback heresy" nor the "silver craze," as one class of our citizens were fond of calling certain recent political phenomena, owed any essential element of its popularity to any desire to repudiate the debt or any part of the debt. It was a dispute only as to the interpretation of a contract. The West is quite as honest as the East. The "silver men" were quite as honest as the "gold men." Neither East nor West proposed to refuse to pay every dollar of the debt. It was simply with the West a resolution to refuse to pay more than it honestly believed was honestly due. That was all. Denunciation does not change the facts of history, and the West has shown that denunciation cannot change its convictions. If this issue, in any other form, should arise again, it may be well

for the Eastern press to remember its utter impotency as a "thunderer," so recently proved, and to argue hereafter on the basis that, while the West will listen respectfully to reason, it will *not* consent to take the sandals from off its feet when it enters the Wall Street Gold Exchange.

Does any man, whatever his politics, believe that the South either does or can regard the national debt as the North regards it? To the South the debt is a perpetual Appomattox; a golden monument of its crushing defeat; a cap of Gessler to which it is compelled to pay daily homage. It is not in human nature to love the hand that smites, even when one sees that the blow was deserved—which the South does not admit and can never see. The national credit was the spring of all the Southern woes. It armed our soldiers and disarmed theirs; it pensioned our soldiers and disgraced theirs. Will the South respect it? The Federal Constitution alone cannot protect it; for no constitutional guarantee can prevent repudiation by indirect methods.

Let us remember that to repudiate the national debt does not demand the same quality of bad faith on the part of the South that Northern repudiation would require. Put ourselves in *its* place, and see how the aspect of this question changes. What did we do? We forced the South to repudiate all its war debts—State, county, and municipal. The fiat of conquest took no note of the financial honor of the conquered. The South had bonds and bondholders as well as the North, and their bondholders have memories as well as ours. Will *they* be likely to insist, if they should ever wield the sceptre of the national power, that our bonds shall be regarded as the most sacred of all forms of property?

But the "South-side view" of the national debt is not complete without another glance backward, if we desire to comprehend, correctly and justly, how differently the South can regard the sacredness of property in national bonds. There existed before the war "a species of property" in the Southern States, hallowed by two centuries of continuous tenure, sanctified by the religious training of their people, associated with the sweetest memories of their childhood and of home, rendered dearer to them than any other possessions by the moral warfare that was waged against it by the outer world, and which they had waged

for it in vindication of their own character before Christendom. They believed that God established it; they knew that the nation defended it. It was property in man. We swept it away by one sublime stroke of the pen. They have not forgotten, and they never can forget, this obliteration, alike of their sectional faith and their most sacred property. No other property can ever again seem so sacred to them. It may not be "conciliation" to state these facts of Southern life; but it is unwise to overlook them in calculating the coming forces that must necessarily control the Democratic party if ever it obtains supreme authority.

Again, the national debt, although protected by the ægis of the Constitution, may be repudiated by national bankruptcy. The Democracy have shown, by their congressional action, that they are eager to travel on that broad road leading to national destruction. With every prudential motive for concealing and postponing their plans of assault on the national Treasury, during the present session of Congress, the measures already introduced involve the expenditure of nearly \$200,000,000 in the Southern States. If these things are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? If, with the lion of a Republican Senate in their pathway, they venture on such wild expenditures, what would they not dare to attempt with a Democratic Congress and a Democratic Executive? They are blind to all the teachings of history who imagine that the men who did not stop before civil war would falter before national bankruptcy. The South believes that it has nothing to lose by the most desperate financial raids on the national Treasury. During the last Congress the Southern claims actually placed on the records exceeded in amount the entire national debt! Under Mr. Riddle's bill, presented in 1876, the new claims therein recognized would have nearly equaled it in amount. That bill provided that "reasonable compensation" should be paid to "*all* citizens of the United States for the use or occupation of their property by the United States army, or any part thereof, during the late civil war." This bill would have enabled every rebel in the Southern States to present a claim for every tree felled, every fence burned, every house destroyed, every potato eaten, every bushel of corn used during the four years of war! It opened wide the gates for robbery, and perjury, and fraud, to enter, by enacting that the only evidence



required for establishing a claim should be "the affidavit of the claimant, supported by the competent testimony of any reputable citizen!"

It is entirely probable, therefore, that the national debt would at least be trebled under a Democratic Administration. The North, as the wealthy section, would be called to bear this Himalayan debt. It could not do it. The nation would be bankrupt.

What has Labor to expect if the Southern Democracy should triumph? Does any working-man expect justice or relief from the rule of politicians whose traditional creed was that capital should not control the service only, but own the bodies of the laborer? Throughout the Southern States, for ten generations, labor was held to be degrading. No laborer, white or black, was esteemed worthy of honor. Work was not worship, but disgrace. In Southern political articles of faith it was declared that the black laborer was a "chattel," and the white laborer a "mudsill."

And they "lived up to" their creed.

Taxation was levied with a merciless rigor on labor, while capital was permitted to dictate its own terms. One example will suffice to establish this fact. I select the State that gave the Confederacy its President. By the laws of Mississippi, before the war, and during President Johnson's provisional government—before a negro voted, or the Republican party existed there—the taxation on land was limited to ten cents an acre of the value of the land. The owner was constituted the sole judge of its value! What was the result? In Hancock County, for example, according to Democratic testimony, "not one-half of the taxable lands were assessed at all, and the assessed portion was generally rated at five cents an acre!" In thousands of instances the assessment was only one dollar an acre. In other words, a cultivated plantation of a thousand rich acres paid only one dollar in taxes! Three illustrations will show how this iniquitous scheme actually worked. Colonel Benson Blake and wife own 8,506 acres of the best cotton-lands in the State, including a magnificent house, and the finest improvements, in the county of Warren. Tax, \$99.78! Colonel Joseph E. Davis owned 3,793 acres of rich "bottom-lands" on the Mississippi River, including

the famous Hurricane plantation. Tax, \$141.14! This estate sold for \$50,000. The heirs of General John A. Quitman owned 6,810 acres of the same rich bottom-lands, "handsomely improved." It included a plantation which was rented for \$30,000 per annum. It was taxed \$184.64! Thus, these three splendid plantations, embracing 19,109 acres of the best land in America, worth at the lowest estimate twenty dollars an acre, paid into the State Treasury only \$439.56 in taxes. Thus the lords of the lash were favored. How did the working-men fare? By an act of the Democratic Legislature of Mississippi, in 1865, it was provided that all blacksmiths, bakers, butchers, brick-makers, carriage-makers, carpenters, dealers in timber, lumber, or shingles, gas-companies, contractors of bridges, printers, gunsmiths, sawmillers, shoemakers, tailors, tanners, watch-makers, painters, milliners, and others, shall pay *twenty-five* cents on every hundred dollars' worth of *gross receipts*—not of capital or profit, but of gross receipts or earnings; while innkeepers, apothecaries, and others, *besides their licenses*, shall pay one dollar on every \$100 of gross receipts! Under this law, in Vicksburg, a livery-stable keeper, in license, and one dollar on every hundred dollars of gross receipts, paid a tax of \$671.03; a firm of apothecaries, \$502.85; a butcher, \$243.70; a firm of bricklayers, on their own work, \$87.76; a shoemaker, \$75.28; a clerk in a hardware-store, with no property except a salary of \$1,200 a year, \$33; a barber, with no assets except his soap, shears, and razor, \$107.63; a colored drayman, for his dray and two mules, \$33.82; a soda-fountain man, \$115.88. Can any record more vividly portray the spirit of the Southern Democratic leaders? Have the Northern labor-reformers anything to hope from these men if they shall ever sit in the seats of national power?

How will such men respect the political rights of labor? Let General Butler, of South Carolina, answer. He was asked by the House committee whether he had said that his colored laborers should not remain on his lands unless they voted the Democratic ticket. He replied:

"I said this: I went down and gave them tickets, and said to them that they had a right to vote the Republican ticket if they pleased; that they were free men, as free as I was; *but if they exercised that right*, and imposed taxes on me which were destroying

my property and prospects, I should throw myself back on some of the rights I had under the laws of the country, *and see that they left my plantations.*"

He had "twenty or thirty" hands.

"Six or seven of them," he said, "voted the Democratic ticket, some of them did not vote at all, and I do not know how the others voted, *but I intend to inform myself.*"

"Q. With a view of turning them off if they voted the Republican ticket? A. Not for voting the Republican ticket if they had an honest ticket, but for voting for these thieves and robbers here *I have done so, and I intend to do it hereafter.*"\*

Among the "thieves" and "robbers" on the Republican ticket were two citizens well known in the North—Rutherford B. Hayes and William A. Wheeler; and the head of the State ticket was Governor Chamberlain, a man whose honesty, civic courage, and intellectual capacity, have been more extravagantly extolled in South Carolina than the merits of any one public man since the days of John C. Calhoun! Conversion by starvation was one of the most potent agencies of the Democratic policy in the savage campaign in South Carolina during the summer of the centennial year.

What has the patriot to hope from the triumph of the Democracy? The two hostile theories of citizenship clinched in civil war. The South taught the doctrine that allegiance was primarily due to the State; the North believed that allegiance was due to the nation only. The Southern leaders still preach the old heresy to the rising generation in their public speeches, their histories, their colleges, their school-books. This theory will confront every honest scheme of national improvement. Temporarily abandoned when the South only is to be benefited, it will obstruct all the great measures of national advancement which, as the country grows, must prove too great and too dangerous to be confided to corporations, and therefore must be undertaken by the nation itself. Democracy is the creed of a province; Republicanism the religion of a nation. Democracy grovels in fetid wards; Republicanism creates imperial commonwealths out of desert wastes.

\* House Mis. Doc. 31, Part 1, p. 303, last session.

What has the philanthropist to hope from the triumph of the Democracy? The most important duty of national statesmanship, although the problem least debated, is the universal education of the people. Democracy is as deadly a foe to education as the Romish Church is to freedom. Democracy has its roots in ignorance. Where Democracy rules, the education of the people is discouraged. Yet no maxim is now more universally accepted than that intelligence and virtue are the foundations of our institutions and the security of our liberties. The popularity of this idea before the war compelled some recognition of education in the States where slavery existed. There were constitutional enforcements of it and statutory provisions for it; but the schools for the people that were established under them in the larger cities were sneeringly described by Governor Hammond, of South Carolina, as "pauper schools." The relicts of this sentiment are distinctly manifested in the States of Delaware and Kentucky, unreached by the reconstruction measures of Congress. To-day these States provide no fund for the education of colored children, excepting what is derived from a tax on the property or polls belonging to this class, or certain fines or forfeitures set apart for this purpose; and the prejudice against them is so great that administration of this trust is not committed to the officers who administer the schools for the whites.

In Maryland and Virginia exceptional circumstances have made these States exceptional in their attitude to the education of the people. Generally, in the other old slave States the reconstruction constitutions had strong clauses enforcing universal education, and corresponding laws were passed under their early Legislatures. The change of the political control of these States was uniformly marked by some blow at the efficiency of the systems of public instruction, either abolishing them altogether or reducing the taxation for educational purposes, or striking at some form of the supervision or other element of efficiency in the system. In Texas, for instance, the Constitutional Convention weakened the constitutional provisions for public instruction, and the Legislature which followed passed such an act that schools were practically abolished for two years in the State. It was enacted that municipalities could assume control of their

schools only by a "majority vote of the property tax-payers" of the town or city.

It is notorious that there is a wide-spread belief in the South that education is fatal to the usefulness of the negro, and hardly less dangerous to the poor white.

Of the 2,000,000 illiterate voters in the United States, seventeen-twentieths are in the Southern States. These States elect 32 of the 74 Senators and 109 of the 292 Representatives in Congress. Hon. Henry W. Blair, in speaking on this topic, says :

"In Alabama 53 per cent. of the voters are illiterate. Ignorance controls the election of the Legislature, members of Congress, the executive, the judiciary, and composes more than half of every jury ; but who controls *ignorance* ? The old slave caste of the South. The same is true in Mississippi, Georgia, and Florida. In Kentucky 28 per cent. is illiterate ; in Maryland 22 ; in Delaware 24, or one-fourth of all power is in these ignorant masses, and they are in the hands of the political Jesuits of the South. It is a deadly fact that the ignorance of the Southern masses wielded by an educated caste, if they once get possession of the Government, can govern and enslave the whole country."

The safety of the nation will one day, and ere long, demand that universal education shall be made compulsory. Does any friend of education believe that this reform will be championed by the Democratic party ?—

The space allotted to this article will not permit me to enumerate other and equally important issues, still pending or quickly coming, in the decision of each and all of which a Democratic triumph would be a national disaster.

There is the question, for example, of protecting freedom of speech and of the press, and the sanctity of our national shekinah—the ballot-box. Free speech is not tolerated in the Southern States excepting where it is impotent to influence the result of the elections. "Boss" Tweed in his worst estate was an honest defender of fairness in elections as compared with the Democratic leaders of South Carolina and the Gulf States. There is no liberty of speech or of the press in all that region, outside of a few of the larger cities ; there are no honest returns ever made of the actual results of congressional elections ; everywhere, men are ostracized, or exiled, or starved into silence, on account of

their political opinions, if they are members of that great party through whose clemency the Democratic leaders escaped an ignominious death on the scaffold.

The Republican party must and shall be maintained, to the end that the great nation may continue to prosper; that its honor may be kept above reproach, or even suspicion of reproach; that its laws may guard the rights of labor and foster universal enlightenment; that fraud may be punished and conspiracy suppressed, and liberty for all perpetuated and extended. It can be kept in power for generations yet to come by refusing, under every temptation, to become the party of retrogression; by scorning to stoop to conciliate irreconcilable traitors, whether to the country or to the Republican creed, or to compromise with the enemies or doubters of the American Idea; by quietly ignoring or sternly rejecting every leader untrue to its principles, whom the accidents of political contention may seat for a time in the high places of authority; by rising above all personal and factional strifes, and avoiding petty and irrelevant issues, and becoming the champion of every progressive idea and project; by letting the dead past bury its dead problems—as the old duty, for example, of protecting the negro, now and forever, placed beyond the reach of the national arm; by supplanting the timid and the faithless among its officers with men of faith and of courage; by worthily representing, in brief, every element of honesty, and honor, and intellectual evolution of the national life. Above all, it must be brave. Richard Cobden, on leaving America, said, “You Republicans lack pluck.” He found Democrats fearlessly advocating the diabolism of politics; and Republicans timidly preaching the sublimest truths. Such men must be deposed as leaders. For this is not a time to sew shrouds, but to prepare for battle.

ANGUS CAMERON.